

EXHIBIT C

LAW OFFICES
J. ANDREW COOMBS
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
517 EAST WILSON AVENUE, SUITE 202
GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA 91206-5902
TELEPHONE (818) 500-3200
FACSIMILE (818) 500-3201

April 17, 2008

Via First Class Mail
And Email

StacyMonahan@QuinnEmanuel.com

Stacy Monahan, Esq.
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges LLP
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 580
Redwood Shores, California 94065

Re: Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. v. NexTag, Inc., et al.
Case No.: CV 07-3763 MMC

Dear Ms. Monahan:

I follow up on our email exchange and telephone conversations of yesterday and earlier today. This confirms that Plaintiff Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. has offered to produce its Rule 30(b)(6) witness in Los Angeles at its expense next week or in San Francisco (also next week) should defendant NexTag, Inc. agree to bear one-half of the out-of-pocket travel costs from Paris incurred for such appearance. As you conceded that this appears to be the position adopted by the Courts in the Northern District (and as the costs for NexTag to travel to Los Angeles to take the deposition are likely to be substantially less than one-half travel costs from Paris) we are confused by NexTag's hesitation in accepting one of these proposals.


To the extent that Defendant objects based on timing, we note, that Plaintiff agreed not to oppose Defendant's application to shorten time on Defendant's motion to compel based upon Defendant's stated urgency in proceeding with the deposition. To the extent that delay is predicated upon the production of documents, we note that Plaintiff has been ready to produce for several weeks and has postponed such production based on Defendants' desire to conduct an exchange. In either event, as we discussed, Plaintiff's production is being made under separate cover today, giving Defendant a week within which to conduct the review.

Stacy Monahan, Esq.
April 17, 2008
Page 2 of 2

This confirms, however, that if Defendant does not promptly accept either proposal, Plaintiff will proceed to vigorously oppose Defendant's motion to compel.

Very Truly Yours,

J. Andrew Coombs,
A Professional Corporation



By: J. Andrew Coombs
Counsel for Plaintiff Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A.

JAC/bm